

REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in response to the Examiner's Action dated May 4, 2005. Applicants have amended the claims to clarify key features of the invention and overcome the claim objections and rejections. No new matter has been added, and the amendments place the claims in better condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments to the claims.

CLAIMS REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

At paragraph 2 of the Office Action, Claims 19-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101, as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 27 has been cancelled and claims 19-26 have been amended such that the invention recited therein is claimed as embodied on a computer-readable medium for execution by a computer. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection in light of the amendments.

CLAIMS REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5, 9-14, 18-23, and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,195,706, issued to Scott (hereinafter *Scott*). Applicants traverse these rejections for the following reasons.

As expressly recited in the claim language of independent claims 1, 10, and 19, Applicants' invention is fundamentally directed to a method/system that utilizes address replacement and network target discovery/rediscovery techniques (such as utilized in iSCSI network systems) to assist in allocation of network target resources. To this end, Applicants claimed method is implemented "during concurrent sessions" and includes steps relating to receiving session information and, responsive to the information, replacing the target node's target address and instructing the one or more initiator nodes to "rediscover" targets.

Scott is directed to the manner in which network addresses are determined, verified and rediscovered network and does not disclose any method or system for allocating target resources using address switching and target rediscovery. Specifically, neither at col. 5, lines 27-34, nor elsewhere does *Scott* disclose steps of "replacing the network target address associated with a target node with a different network target address" in response to a received session message as expressly required by the limitations of the previously unamended independent claims. Instead,

col. 5, lines 27-34 describes transmission of a Network Configuration Packet that contains various address data such as the Ethernet address of the Target/Server Host and an IP address without any disclosure or suggestion relating to address replacement. In addition, *Scott* fails to disclose or suggest a step of “issuing a target rediscovery message to the at least one initiator node ...” also performed in response to the same received session message. Col. 5, lines 39-42 generally explains the need to find an alternative source of IP addressing information if neither DHCP nor the SetWz utility are available. Col. 7, lines 40-48 describes steps performed when already in discovery mode. Col. 8, lines 3-24 describes steps performed during verification/rediscovery mode but does not express disclose issuing a target rediscovery message.

The standard for a § 102 rejection requires that the reference teach each element recited in the claims set forth within the invention. As clearly outlined above, *Scott* fails to meet this standard and therefore does not anticipate Applicants’ invention as recited in the independent claims.

The foregoing notwithstanding, independent claims 1, 10, and 19 have been amended to more clearly characterize and distinguish Applicants’ proposed invention from the prior art. Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite, in part, a method for adaptively allocating target resources comprising “during the concurrent sessions, receiving session feedback relating to one or more of the concurrent sessions from one of the at least one initiator node or the target node.” Applicants believe this clarification of the nature of the session information as relating to the sessions associated with a particular target address that is subsequently replaced as part of the target resource allocation process clearly distinguishes Applicants’ invention from the disclosure of *Scott* and other prior art references.

Since *Scott* does not disclose or suggest replacing a target address together with issuing a target rediscovery message directing initiator nodes to rediscover available target nodes in response to session feedback from sessions associated with the replaced address, claims 1, 10, and 19 and all claims depending therefrom are patentable in view of *Scott* as well as all other prior art known to Applicants.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have diligently responded to the Office Action by particularly pointing out how the claims are patentably distinct from the prior art and respectfully request issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all claims now pending.

Applicants invite the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney of record at 512.343.6116 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Baca', is written over a horizontal line.

Matthew W. Baca

Reg. No. 42,277

Dillon & Yudell LLP

8911 North Capital of Texas Highway

Suite 2110

Austin, Texas 78759

512.343.6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)